REMARKS

Claims 1-44 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1-44 were rejected in the Final Office Action dated August 30, 2004. No claims are amended in this Response. Accordingly, claims 1-44 are at issue in the above-identified application.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Young et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,280,575). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection to claim 1, for example, at least because *Young et al.* does not teach or suggest "storing on a first record property data of said spreadsheet file," "storing on a second record access data of said spreadsheet file," nor "storing on a third record spreadsheet cell data for a plurality of spreadsheet cells." As acknowledged by the Examiner in the Final Office Action dated August 30, 2004, *Young et al.* does not teach any of the limitations in the body of the claim. For example, the Examiner states in the Final Office Action, "*Young et al.* do[es] not explicitly teach storing on a first record property data of said spreadsheet file; storing on a second record access data of said spreadsheet file; storing on a third record spreadsheet cell data for a plurality of spreadsheet cells." (Final Office Action, p. 2). Applicants acknowledge that these limitations are not taught by the cited reference *Young et al.* and submit that they are not rendered obvious in view of the cited reference.

In particular, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection to claim 1 at least because *Young et al.* does not disclose "storing on a second record access data of said spreadsheet" as recited, for example, and in claim 1. *Young et al.* does not teach or suggest "access data." In the present application, access data stored on a separate record may be used to efficiently index and

access cell data. (See, for example, p. 16, ll. 3-7, p. 17, ll. 1-3. See also, for example, p. 21, l. 19 - p. 23, l. 4).

Young et al. discloses no similar aspect. In *Young et al.*, cell data is simply stored in cells without a way to efficiently index or access the cell data, and no access data is stored on a separate record for efficiently indexing or accessing cell data. *Young et al.* states "[t]he tabular data structure 10 thus provides a data structure in which rows, as well as cells in each row, may be close packed, by use of the row identifie[r]s in row number field 92 and the cell column identifiers in the cell column number field 100." (Col. 8, ll. 48-52; See also Fig. 5D). There is no access data stored on a second record for accessing this data. As a result, *Young et al.* does not teach or suggest "storing on a second record access data of said spreadsheet." Notably, the lack of this limitation is acknowledged by the Examiner. (Final Office Action, p.2).

In the Response to Arguments, the Examiner asserts that "the Office asserts that the skilled artisan would have known various methods of storing information in separate areas of memory." (Final Office Action, p. 9). Applicants respectfully traverse this assertion and request that the Examiner cite references as they pertain specifically to the limitations of the claims at issue pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(c)(2) and M.P.E.P. 2144.03.

At least for the reasons above and the reasons discussed in the previous Amendment dated May 25, 2004, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited reference *Young et al.* Claims 2-11 which depend from claim 1 are also patentable over *Young et al.* for at least the same reasons.

For reasons stated above with respect to claim 1, Applicants submit that the rejection of independent claims 12, 23, and 34 should be withdrawn. With respect to claims 13-22, 24-33,

and 35-44, these claims depend from claims 12, 23, and 34, respectively, and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, Applicants submit that all claims are allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 31, 2005

By: _____
Kimani P. Clark
Registration No. 45,969

Customer Number: 26263
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
Phone: (202) 408-9214
Fax: (312) 876-7457